Dear Js, 1/17/72

Because we enjoy your letters much and benefit from some of the mature suggestions, which I get from no others with maturity and experience upon which they can draw, I will make no further response to the enclosures with yours of the 11th, which actually got here three days ago. They are all helpful and interesting, esp. the memo on Rand. I presume you will watch that perhaps significant and certainly fascinating item. I think, on the basis of what would be worth the trouble, that it is of J's, not R's, unless there is a chance he used the plural without detection.

I have been snowed under with what I've been trying to do with the Lattimer scandla, think I've sent you most of it to date, if not all, had to do it too fast, and we 've had company almost daily now since Xmas, which is a serious impediment to my own progress. The one who just left, a fine 40ish woman reporter the best xpert on the Kaplan-Vidal case, was good for us because once she had a chance to relax and feel us out and feel at home her bubbly character was without restraint and her delicious and infectuous humor was good for us in between periods of work. I had things she didn't on that case and gave it to her, including some of your clips. I'll pick them up when I ee the friend who will be making the copies for her for me later this week. Confidentially, typically those highly-pincipled people of her period with Ra,parts have robbed her and gotten a sizable advance on a book of which they are now genuinely sick. They salbe themselves by kindness to her in the book. And she has two kinds to raise without the help of a separated (alcoholic) husband while trying to make a liying. You have heard me say sometimes I wish I had more ebenimes and fewer "friends". I thnk she suffers the affliction of some "friends", too.

Je-no need to return Martha tape. I've found Excelsior and will send separately. Lil read as soon as I did, smiled broadly, which she has felt little occasion to do lately, and asys thanks. For the pantd as for the suggestions.

Retrieval is always a problem, especially for me because I have had to, or felt I had do, orient my own filing around projected use, and that nobody can duplicate. I think in most cases the things are what I think might inform of amuse you or of sucha character where you might not be unwilling to say you goofed on that one, or what I might want someone else to have in case. But I have no idea how to answer this wise anticipation.

What Jim says about Lattimer and the attention tends to confirm the belief that has been gwoing on me, that we missed a golden opportunity. I won't burden you with my ideas on why, but I don't hide my increasing disgust with the self-conceived queens ans kings of the past who do little but apologize and pontificate and throttle work by intrusions in that which they no ,onger undertand, make needless problems, not, I think, from devotion to the cause anymore but from a combination of causes, guilt feelings, ambitions jealousies (often to the younger attributed to me, as a letter I've just answered from one of whom I've grown quit find said - and I asked him of whom he felt I might consider I had cause to feel jealous), ehos (which we all have, but here the ego-tripping has been attributed to me too) . What I do genuinely fear that if this keeps up, I may decided that survival demands what could be commercial, a thorough exposure. I hate to think of even thinking about it. And I hate having to contend with it, as I often do with much more delicacy than my normally blunt letters would lead you to believe, for I do the other way vocally. I've very glad you raised the question of the significance of the year. I was aware of it and wondered if this could be it. It falls down in one respect and the one that caused me to abandon it because I can find no candidate willing to use it. I know of but one instance in which one (McG) said that were he elected, he thinks there should eb a new investigation. But that only when oressed by informed kids on a distant campus and with no press. They have all refused. At one time or another I've approached all the "loberal" ones. Even when freidds in the press did it and they said they'd sure have to invite me in, it never happened. If I wanted to be real sinister, I'd suggest a possible farout possibility is to quiet Teddy. Lattime : you'll be seeing refs to what I have on him. If

reading the enclosed you have anything to which I haven't referred, I'd appreciate copies. If I didn't refer to the CDN story of his speech there, I also have it. And the reprint (International Surgeon, I think)....No, I agree with you on the Chron tretetment and its significance. I think it is an accurate reflection of what you suggest and more, ennui with the entire subject, aided and abetted by the outoourings of the buts which does reach enough desks. I have done nothing to respond yet and have only two things planned, one in the hope of feedback, the other in the certainty it will be eavesdropped upon. L's ignorance, as you suggest, is larger than even he realizes, but his politics make this fascinating and I hope a serious embarrassment to those who selected or agreed to him. If the K's rep didn't select, he and they may have some questions after this about those who did. As you will see, by indirection I have made an effort to learnthat I do not expect to succeed but do hope gets read....TV analysis simple and persuasive, but I linger with the hope that a teensy-weensy bit was a remnant of principle. Anderson's source may be the spookery, but he has also said it is someone involved who is opposed to policy, which neither qualifies nor disqualifies but tends to persuade me that it is more likely not a spookery sppok. You are tright on the trial balloons, but they also includes others than the spookery, even the FBI, a rather frequent one in the past, and DJ, all sorts of unlikelies if his writings about them are to be considered. I am inclined not to agree with the rightist-righteous attitude that this will drawn the administration more inward. It may, if your hunch is correct, also be a warning that they should be listened to more. But I think as I have about CIA, that its disagreement is no more than about tactics, that it has taken the lead in fixing wrong policies, which means that if true, unless there has been a major internal overhaul, of which I've seen no sign, this is not too likely. I've explained my belief about the voids in the PPapers and that this and disagreement over what couldn't succeed account for the fair face....Tapes, thanks, I'll be switching to Sony as soonas I use up what I have. No trouble since simply because I've tried each one first. I had detected places in the middle where they hang. I suppose that when I get my older machine back, if it has, as I suspect, a more powerful motor, the thing to do it tun each one through it twice to get the tension the way it should be.

If you can send me a copy of the Palo Alto Times story I have someone in LA with the brass to ask, whether or not he gets an answer, and the means of asking why that should be so hushhush and what the hell the taxpayer's buck is being spent that way for. There are a couple on the hill to whom I might well send copies, but not of your note on a memo from me.

Gotta get to the rest of the stack. With all our hearts, our gratitude for what is in and what has come for yours. Best, very best,